

identical sub-family names occur in the crustacean family CYTHEREIDAE without causing confusion. Therefore, I hold that the similarity of family names is no bar to the employment of *Crago* and *Crangon*.

With reference to File Z.N.(S.)209, on the basis of usage I think we should certainly accept *Ligia* of Fabricius, 1798, in spite of the fact that the Weber application of *Ligia* is older. Here we might argue that *Ligia* is a genus not much treated by American authors who tend to accent Weber and hence the weight of opinion rests on the Europeans. However, this would mean contravening the decision of the International Commission, while upholding it in the previous case. If this be done, then we have in effect nullification and while nullification is a time-honoured American method of popular legislation, I think it would be unsafe to introduce it into the legislation with regard to zoological nomenclature. Hence, as regards these two cases, I would like to see the opinion of 1904 stand in spite of the fact that it may appear to cause some confusion. Here, I think, no further confusion will be caused than already exists.

Turning now to File Z.N.(S.)501, the apparent situation is somewhat similar. It would appear that Meigen himself wished to suppress his names of 1800 in favour of those of 1803. And the Commission might, in *Opinion* 28, have been better advised to follow Meigen rather than the letter of the law. However, the instant case *Tylos* versus *Micropeza* is not as simple as some of the other cases may be. There is a genus *Tylos* in the Isopod Crustacea proposed by V. Audouin in 1825. This genus, which is the type genus of the family and the sole genus of the family, has enjoyed uninterrupted use since that time. There exists only one possible synonym due to L. Koch in 1856. In spite of the testimony of von Ebner in 1868, the title of Koch's name to be considered a synonym of *Tylos* is clouded. It has never been employed as an accepted generic name since 1856. We may set then this uninterrupted use of the generic name *Tylos* against the fact that on Aezél's own showing the name was used in the Diptera only occasionally so recently as 1932 and certainly *Micropeza* is fully as well known. Parenthetically, the family name TYLIDAE in the Crustacea dates back at least to 1885 while in the Diptera it dates only from 1931. Therefore, in this case it would seem as though there would be less ultimate confusion if *Tylos* of Meigen were declared ineligible, not on the basis of a reversal of *Opinion* 28, but rather on the basis that it comes into conflict with a name in another group which has enjoyed a century and a quarter of uninterrupted use; use which dates back to the days when Meigen's own wishes with regard to the names of 1800 were followed.

SUPPORT FOR APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED BY DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS IN REGARD TO THE NAMES OF FIVE GENERA OF THE CLASS CRUSTACEA

By I. GORDON, D.Sc., Ph.D.

(British Museum (Natural History), London)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)231, 209, 473, 474, 475)

(Letter dated 29th October 1951)

I wish to say that I am willing to add my support to all the proposals submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. L. B. Holthuis:

Commission's Reference Z.N.(S.)231 (*Crangon*)

" " Z.N.(S.)209 (*Ligia*)

" " Z.N.(S.)473 (*Scyllarides*)

" " Z.N.(S.)474 (*Lysiosquilla*)

" " Z.N.(S.)475 (*Odontodactylus*)